

# 2006 – 2007 MINNESOTA CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ENERGY AND CO<sub>2</sub> SAVINGS REPORT

**January 15, 2009** 

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Secti	o <b>n</b>		Page
I.	INTRODUC	CTION	1
II.	CHANGES	TO CIP AS A RESULT OF THE NGEA OF 2007	2
III.	PROGRESS	S RELATED TO THE NGEA OF 2007	3
	A. Deemo	ed Savings Database Development	3
	B. Measu	rement And Verification	4
	C. Resear	rch And Development	4
	D. Electri	ic Utility Infrastructure Projects	4
IV.	ESTIMATE	ED CARBON DIOXIDE REDUCTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH CIP	5
	A. Metho	dology	5
	B. Total l	Energy and Carbon Dioxide Savings	5
	C. Saving	gs by Utility	6
	D. Saving	gs by Market Sector	9
V.	CONCLUS	ION	13

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The Minnesota Conservation Improvement Program (CIP), first enacted by the Minnesota Legislature in 1982, requires Minnesota natural gas and electric utilities to invest a portion of their revenues in energy efficiency and conservation programs. These programs are intended to provide incentives to consumers and businesses for saving energy through the purchase of energy efficient equipment and/or changing behaviors related to energy consumption. Typical conservation improvement programs include furnace rebates, lighting rebates, and building design assistance. Utility CIPs are funded through surcharges added to the electric and natural gas rates charged to utility customers. The Office of Energy Security (OES) in the Minnesota Department of Commerce provides regulatory oversight over use of CIP funds.

There are three primary benefits of conservation. First, conservation helps the utilities and their customers avoid the operating costs of providing more electricity and natural gas such as buying fuel and operating and maintaining power plants. Second, conservation helps the utilities and their customers avoid or delay the capital costs of adding new system capacity such as new power plants, transmission lines, natural gas pipelines, and distribution systems. Third, conservation reduces carbon dioxide and other emissions released by burning fossil fuels.

Conservation is a critical part of Minnesota's efforts to meet its residents' energy needs and reduce greenhouse gases. In 2007, Minnesota's utilities devoted approximately \$108 million to CIP activities and achieved total annual energy savings of 464,000 MWh of electricity and 1.9 million MCF of natural gas, resulting in approximately 535,000 tons of avoided carbon dioxide emissions. Historically, CIP projects have reduced electricity consumption in Minnesota by approximately 0.8 percent annually out of an estimated growth rate of 2.3 percent without CIP. Legislation passed in 2007 strengthened Minnesota's commitment to energy savings, establishing an annual savings goal of 1.5 percent of retail sales for electric and natural gas utilities, which is in addition to the spending requirements that are already in place.

The OES strives to ensure that the electricity and natural gas savings reported through CIP are accurate and that programs are operated cost-effectively<sup>2</sup> through the CIP planning and review process. Investor-owned utilities are required to file proposed CIP plans, covering one to three years, with the OES.<sup>3</sup> The OES employs a variety of methods and tools to review the plans, and has authority to modify program goals or savings assumptions. Investor-owned utilities also file annual status reports summarizing program performance including custom commercial/industrial projects completed during the year. Since these custom projects typically are quite large, OES typically reviews a selection of these custom projects to ensure that the engineering assumptions

<sup>1</sup> See the 2005 Legislative Auditors Report on the Energy Conservation Improvement Program available at: http://www.auditor.leg.state.mn.us/Ped/2005/pe0504.htm.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cost-effectiveness in Minnesota CIPs are defined according to four benefit-cost tests: Societal, Ratepayer, Participant, and Utility. More information on these tests is provided in the Legislative Auditor's Report noted above. The OES focuses on the Societal test as a measure of program cost-effectiveness consistent with its mission as a public agency.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> OES has established a filing schedule that will eventually result in all utilities filing three-year plans.

and methodologies are sound. The process for regulating cooperative and municipal utility CIPs is similar to the investor-owned utility procedures, though due to their status as non-rate regulated entities, OES's role is more advisory in nature.

Minnesota's conservation and efficiency programs have been widely heralded in their successes and achievements. In 2008, the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, a highly respected research and advocacy organization, ranked Minnesota's utility conservation programs as fourth in the nation in terms of program policies and practices. With the 2007 changes to the CIP statutes discussed below, utilities and OES are challenged to increase the energy and carbon dioxide savings from CIP even further, while still maintaining cost-effective programs.

#### II. CHANGES TO CIP AS A RESULT OF THE NGEA OF 2007

During the 2007 legislative session, the Legislature passed The Next Generation Energy Act of 2007 (Laws of 2007, Chapter 136) which significantly changed CIP. The most significant change was the addition of the 1.5 percent savings goal for all utilities, which changed the focus of CIP compliance from meeting spending requirements to meeting a savings goal. Previously the law required that each natural gas and electric utility spend 0.5 percent or 1.5 percent of gross operating revenues (GOR) annually, <sup>5</sup> respectively, on their CIPs. The revised statute added an energy savings goal for each utility equal to 1.5 percent of its average annual retail energy sales in Minnesota, excluding sales to certain facilities that have been granted exemption from CIP charges by the Commissioner of Commerce. <sup>6</sup> The CIP savings goal is related to the broader state goal of reducing per capita fossil fuel use by 15 percent by 2015, and is ultimately an integral part of any effort to reduce statewide CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Recognizing the diverse challenges faced by Minnesota's utilities, the NGEA included a provision which allows the Director of the OES to adjust a utility's savings goal based on its historical conservation investment experience, customer class makeup, load growth, a conservation potential study, or other factors determined by the Director. Based on one or more of these factors, the Director may lower a utility's savings goal, though 1 percent is the minimum level. The law also allowed for the possibility of counting certain waste heat electricity generation projects and utility infrastructure improvements towards CIP, though savings from these projects count in addition to the 1 percent minimum through conservation improvements..

The NGEA also expanded the allowable program activities under CIP, specifying that savings can be achieved through rate design, energy codes and appliance standard changes, market transformation programs, programs designed to change consumer behavior, and utility infrastructure efficiency improvements, in addition to traditional demand-side programs. Certain

<sup>5</sup> Xcel Energy, as a utility owning nuclear generating facilities, is required to spend 2 percent of gross revenues annually.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See "The 2008 State Energy Efficiency Scorecard" (Washington, DC: American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, October 2008), page 2. Full report available at http://www.aceee.org/pubs/e086.htm.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Each utility's savings goal is based on an average of the weather normalized retail sales over the most recent threeyear period, excluding sales to large energy facilities that have been exempted from CIP by the Commissioner of the Department of Commerce. Minnesota Power, Marshall Municipal Utilities, Xcel Energy, and Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation are the only utilities with exempted customers.

waste heat to electricity generation projects are also now allowable under CIP. These changes opened up a number of new avenues for utilities to achieve the 1.5 percent savings goal, though more work is needed to quantify the savings from these activities. The consumer behavioral programs offer significant potential savings to residential consumers and are especially important to utilities with largely residential loads. Several research and pilot projects are underway now to determine how to best quantify the savings from these new program options.

Based on historic savings levels through CIP, the 1.5 percent savings goal is often regarded as a "stretch goal" for most utilities, representing a doubling of electric energy savings and a nearly 2.5 times increase in gas savings over 2007 savings levels (though the range across utilities is large, with some utilities having to increase their savings by much greater factors.) Utilities are currently working on intensifying their program activities and exploring new technologies and programs in preparation for the savings goal taking effect in 2010.

#### III. PROGRESS RELATED TO THE NGEA OF 2007

#### A. DEEMED SAVINGS DATABASE DEVELOPMENT

The OES is assisting utilities in identifying those efficiency and conservation measures and strategies that produce the most cost-effective energy savings. The OES is also working with utilities and stakeholders on determining how to calculate those energy savings in a scientifically accurate manner. The OES has hired an experienced engineering firm to identify, review and assess the assumptions used to determine the energy savings for many standard efficiency measures. The contractor has identified a range of energy savings estimates for each typical conservation improvement measures, many of which are implemented by utilities and energy service companies around the nation. While there is a vast body of energy saving estimates associated with these measures, the estimated energy savings for each measure can vary broadly, depending on climate, facility type, and end use of a measure. This can call into question the validity of the engineering calculations used to determine energy savings, and lead to an array of different energy savings calculations between utilities. The OES project will assess the methodologies used for the varying estimates to identify those estimates and calculations that are most reliable for Minnesota utilities to use in their conservation improvement projects. In addition, the OES will convene ongoing stakeholder workgroups to finalize the underlying assumptions, revise the calculations as necessary (e.g., to reflect a change in baseline standards), and add new measures as they become available.

There is a need for ongoing research to verify the savings associated with measures that are rebated under utility conservation programs. This could include field monitoring of installed measures that would provide data on the actual savings of one technology over its standard efficiency counterpart. Such a testing program could also provide savings verification of different conservation strategies and indirect program activities. Potentially, the testing program could become a regional or national center for energy efficiency verification that would serve a similar function for conservation programs as the Underwriters Laboratory currently provides for electrical equipment. The primary purpose of this center would be to verify the energy savings assumptions that make up a Deemed Savings Database. This center could be self-sustaining in

that it could provide the basic data for the energy savings, and associated measure lifetimes of a host of energy efficiency and conservation measures.

#### B. MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION

The OES will continue to work with all utilities to increase Measurement and Verification (M&V) activities. In 2008, the OES established M&V protocols<sup>7</sup> for all utilities, which require that utility projects with first-year savings of 1,000,000 kWh of electricity or 20,000 MCF of natural gas undergo specific M&V activities to ensure that the savings are being realized. The savings levels that trigger M&V requirements were discussed extensively with utility stakeholders and were established at a level that was sufficient to keep M&V costs at a reasonable level relative to the savings achieved. The OES set a guideline that M&V costs should be limited to less than 10 percent of the projects projected first-year savings.

#### C. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The NGEA authorized the OES to assess utilities up to \$3.6 million annually for research and development projects that further the ability of utilities to reach their 1.5 percent energy conservation goal. Over the last year, OES has met with utilities and other stakeholders to get input on the types of projects that utilities think would be most beneficial to identifying new energy savings programs to assist in meeting the energy conservation goal. OES issued its first request for proposals in April 2008 to fund research into specific types of new conservation measures, including conservation potential assessments, technology pilot projects, and programs targeted at influencing consumer behavior. The OES received a total of 42 proposals with requests for more than \$10 million and matching funds of over \$5 million. From these projects, the OES selected 10 proposals for \$1.65 million in available funding. This new authority provides an ability to fund new projects aimed at assessing assess new promising efficiency technologies and strategies and communicate the results to Minnesota utilities so they can assess the costs and impact that the technology could have if applied in their service territory.

#### D. ELECTRIC UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

An additional area where the OES will be working with utilities and stakeholders is in the evaluation of the energy savings impacts of electric utility infrastructure (EUI) projects. Such an effort will include the development of a reference database of these projects that can be accessed by utilities. Currently there is little guidance available to utilities for quantifying the energy savings associated with EUI projects. This is partly by design: as there is little experience in working with these projects, we did not want to overly restrict utilities, and the engineers that evaluate these projects. Furthermore, these types of projects only apply to the 0.5 percent of energy savings above 1 percent, so the magnitude of savings associated with these project types will be limited, although capturing these savings will be critical for some utilities to meet the full 1.5 percent energy savings goal.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See the Director of the Office of Energy Security's Decision dated July 23, 2008 in Docket No. 06-1591, <a href="https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/EFiling/ShowFile.do?DocNumber=5376649">https://www.edockets.state.mn.us/EFiling/ShowFile.do?DocNumber=5376649</a>

#### IV. ESTIMATED CARBON DIOXIDE REDUCTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH CIP

#### A. METHODOLOGY

The  $CO_2$  savings associated with CIP were calculated by first compiling the total annual electricity or natural gas savings reported by each utility for 2006 and 2007. These savings figures were verified by the OES as part of the CIP regulatory process described in Section I. Total annual  $CO_2$  savings were then calculated by multiplying the savings totals by the appropriate emissions factor (average pounds of  $CO_2$  emitted per MWh of electricity or MCF of natural gas).

Since electricity consumed in Minnesota is generated from a variety of sources, both inside and outside the state, it is appropriate to use a regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions factor to calculate the avoided CO<sub>2</sub> emissions due to the electricity savings associated with CIP. For this report, the most recent CO<sub>2</sub> emissions factor for the Midwest Reliability Organization (MRO) region, 1,810 lbs of CO<sub>2</sub> per MWh, was selected. This figure is reported annually by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to the Minnesota Department of Commerce and Public Utilities Commission.<sup>8</sup> For natural gas, an average CO<sub>2</sub> emissions factor of 121 lbs of CO<sub>2</sub> per MCF was used based on the chemical composition of natural gas.<sup>9</sup>

Note that the energy and CO<sub>2</sub> savings reported are *incremental* – that is, they are the first-year savings that result from new participants in existing or new programs. The total, or *cumulative* savings occurring in a given year also include measures enacted in previous years. However, since it is problematic to track cumulative savings, the OES only tracks incremental savings.

#### B. TOTAL ENERGY AND CARBON DIOXIDE SAVINGS

The table below summarizes the total energy and carbon dioxide savings generated through CIP in 2006 and 2007.

Table 1: Electric and Gas CIP Incremental Savings in 2006 and 2007

	Electric Savings (kWh)	CO <sub>2</sub> Savings (tons)	Gas Savings (MCF)	CO <sub>2</sub> Savings (tons)
2006	411,998,552	360,499	2,095,047	126,750
2007	463,542,698	405,600	1,917,144	115,987
Total	875,541,250	766,099	4,012,191	242,737

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> The MPCA reports updated regional average emissions factors annually to the Minnesota Department of Commerce and Public Utilities Commission for use in preparation of environmental disclosures, as required by the Commission in its Order Clarifying Disclosure Requirements and Setting Procedural Schedule issued September 3, 2002. The most recent figures as of the writing of this report were from 2005, as reported in the October 30, 2008 letter from MPCA filed under docket no. E,G999/CI-00-1343.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Since natural gas is a primary fuel with high degree of uniformity in composition, an emissions factor of 121 lbs of CO2 per MCF is generally used to compute CO<sub>2</sub> savings.

### C. SAVINGS BY UTILITY

Tables 2a and 2b list the kWh/MCF CIP savings, actual spending, and estimated CO<sub>2</sub> savings by utility in 2006 and 2007. The MRO regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions factor for electricity described above was used to estimate the CO<sub>2</sub> savings for each electric utility. Note that the actual CO<sub>2</sub> saving for each utility varies according to the mix of generation sources serving the utility's territory throughout the year. Depending on the utility's mix of generating assets and power purchasing arrangements, different utilities have different carbon intensities in the electricity provided to their customers. However, since it difficult to compute an individual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions factor for each utility based on available sources, a constant regional emissions factor was used instead.

Table 2a: 2006 CIP Savings by Utility

Table 2a: 2000 CIF	buvings by C	tility	
	kWh		CO <sub>2</sub> Savings
Utility	Savings	Spending	(tons)
Electric IOUs			
Alliant Energy	13,636,911	\$1,967,904	12,341
Minnesota Power	45,940,938	\$3,794,856	41,577
Otter Tail Power	14,027,710	\$1,936,644	12,695
Xcel Energy	256,386,037	\$42,880,121	232,029
Totals - IOU Electrics	329,991,596	\$50,579,525	298,642
Electric Coops			
Dairyland Power Coop	2,482,889	\$1,966,538	2,247
East River Electric Power Coop, Inc.	383,959	\$285,030	347
Great River Energy	32,076,202	\$18,194,936	29,029
Minnesota Valley Coop L&P	469,500	\$190,467	425
Minnkota Power Coop	4,634,379	\$2,290,124	4,194
Sioux Valley Southwestern Electric	1,989,511	\$73,446	1,801
<b>Totals - Electric Coops</b>	42,036,440	\$23,000,541	38,043
Electric Municipals <sup>1</sup>			
Alexandria Light & Power	933,739	\$229,616	845
Benson Municipal Utilities	100,633	\$108,605	91
Brainerd Public Utilities	2,314,037	\$144,782	2,094
City of Anoka	1,425,198	\$308,336	1,290
City of Jackson	160,278	\$42,215	145
City of Luverne	721,622	\$177,763	653
Detroit Lakes Public Utility	373,863	\$139,800	338
East Grand Forks Water & Light Dept.	162,414	\$368,424	147
Glencoe Light & Power Commission	317,264	\$71,214	287
Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission	1,853,086	\$103,132	1,677
Hibbing Public Utilities Commission	11,655	\$73,827	11
Hutchinson Utilities Commission	1,264,611	\$166,495	1,144
Marshall Municipal Utilities	1,793,001	\$326,403	1,623
Melrose Public Utilities	1,094,520	\$88,764	991
Minnesota Municipal Power Agency	856,689	\$636,000	775
Moorhead Public Service	1,282,024	\$381,579	1,160

Table 2a: 2006 CIP Savings by Utility (continued)

Table 2a: 2000 CIF Savii		(continued)	
	kWh		CO <sub>2</sub> Savings
Utility	Savings	Spending	(tons)
New Ulm Public Utilities	1,889,810	\$400,271	1,710
Shakopee Public Utilities	4,462,076	\$623,290	4,038
Southern MN Municipal Power Agency	4,125,429	\$1,404,014	3,734
St. James Municipal Light & Power	73,708	\$49,537	67
Thief River Falls Municipal Utility	791,592	\$205,741	716
Triad (Austin, Owatonna, Rochester)	12,399,386	\$2,028,425	11,221
Wadena Light & Water	28,599	\$48,418	26
Willmar Municipal Utilities	775,110	\$287,085	701
Windom Municipal Utilities	83,415	\$74,605	75
Worthington Public Utilities	676,758	\$176,833	612
Totals - Electric Municipals	39,970,517	\$8,665,174	36,173
TOTALS - ELECTRIC CIP	411,998,552	\$82,245,240	372,859
	MCF		CO <sub>2</sub> Savings
Utility	Savings	Spending	(tons)
Gas IOUs			
Alliant	23,788	\$478,471	1,439
CenterPoint Energy	937,274	\$7,374,410	56,705
Great Plains Natural Gas	13,877	\$241,329	840
Greater Minnesota Gas	1,709	\$14,190	103
Minnesota Energy Resources - NMU	22,230	\$405,244	1,345
Minnesota Energy Resources - PNG	151,518	\$1,750,611	9,167
Xcel Energy	927,029	\$5,076,771	56,085
Totals - Gas IOUs	2,077,425	\$15,341,026	125,684
			ŕ
Gas Municipals			
Duluth Dept. of Public Works	8,087	\$713,939	489
Hutchinson Utilities Commission	922	\$28,900	56
Triad (Austin & Owatonna)	8,613	\$183,128	521
Totals - Gas Municipals	17,622	\$925,967	1,066
TOTALS - GAS CIP	2,095,047	\$16,266,993	126,750

<sup>1</sup> Municipalities include only large utilities that reported energy savings for 2006 and 2007. The City of Virginia is not included since it had not submitted a CIP filing by the time of this report.

Table 2b: 2007 CIP Savings by Utility

		-	CO <sub>2</sub> Savings
Utility	kWh Savings	Spending	(tons)
Electric IOUs		•	, ,
Alliant Energy	16,990,441	\$2,562,634	15,376
Minnesota Power	44,168,014	\$3,908,222	39,972
Otter Tail Power	11,617,820	\$1,862,501	10,514
Xcel Energy	259,207,821	\$47,382,643	234,583
Totals - IOU Electrics	331,984,096	\$55,716,000	300,446
Electric Coops			
-	2 219 501	\$2.052.700	3,003
Dairyland Power Coop	3,318,591	\$2,053,709	*
East River Electric Power Coop, Inc.	295,529	\$284,979	267
Great River Energy	58,060,845	\$20,872,525	52,545
Minnesota Valley Coop L&P	554,550	\$246,184	502
Minnkota Power Coop	5,061,664	\$2,284,562	4,581
Sioux Valley Southwestern Electric	2,164,796	\$73,086	1,959
Totals - Electric Coops	69,455,975	\$25,815,045	62,858
Electric Municipals <sup>1</sup>			
Alexandria Light & Power	1,266,653	\$280,627	1,146
Benson Municipal Utilities	271,042	\$128,009	245
Brainerd Public Utilities	1,956,427	\$199,998	1,771
City of Anoka	804,650	\$350,447	728
City of Jackson	760,172	\$57,312	688
City of Luverne	558,482	\$114,785	505
Detroit Lakes Public Utility	606,008	\$127,047	548
East Grand Forks Water & Light Dept.	593,362	\$342,030	537
Glencoe Light & Power Commission	703,549	\$93,836	637
Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission	1,683,822	\$110,238	1,524
Hibbing Public Utilities Commission	178,637	\$99,758	162
Hutchinson Utilities Commission	5,624,104	\$251,862	5,090
Marshall Municipal Utilities	3,628,227	\$343,660	3,284
Melrose Public Utilities	181,599	\$37,420	164
Minnesota Municipal Power Agency	2,045,632	\$681,336	1,851
Moorhead Public Service	1,257,909	\$407,689	1,138
New Ulm Public Utilities	2,129,389	\$335,831	1,927
Shakopee Public Utilities	7,653,643	\$727,792	6,927
Southern MN Municipal Power Agency	6,112,231	\$1,629,377	5,532
St. James Municipal Light & Power	329,668	\$49,039	298
Thief River Falls Municipal Utility	722,322	\$223,860	654
Triad (Austin, Owatonna, Rochester)	19,895,990	\$2,516,333	18,006
Wadena Light & Water	13,532	\$54,392	12
Willmar Municipal Utilities	1,186,110	\$305,235	1,073
Windom Municipal Utilities	1,480,922	\$74,856	1,340
Worthington Public Utilities	458,545	\$165,612	415
Totals - Electric Municipals	62,102,627	\$9,708,381	56,203
TOTALS - ELECTRIC CIP	463,542,698	\$91,239,426	419,506
TOTALS - ELECTRIC CII	703,374,070	φ <b>71,437,44U</b>	717,300

**Table 2b: 2007 CIP Savings by Utility (continued)** 

Utility	kWh Savings	Spending	CO <sub>2</sub> Savings (tons)
Gas IOUs			
Alliant	15,096	\$282,637	913
CenterPoint Energy	825,031	\$7,553,362	49,914
Great Plains Natural Gas	17,658	\$244,304	1,068
Greater Minnesota Gas <sup>2</sup>			
Minnesota Energy Resources - NMU	22,756	\$373,490	1,377
Minnesota Energy Resources - PNG	118,899	\$1,561,483	7,193
Xcel Energy	888,460	\$5,576,438	53,752
Totals - Gas IOUs	1,887,900	\$15,591,714	114,218
Gas Municipals			
Duluth Dept. of Public Works	4,208	\$473,371	255
Hutchinson Utilities Commission	5,872	\$150,104	355
Triad (Austin & Owatonna)	19,164	\$191,241	1,159
Totals - Gas Municipals	29,244	\$814,716	1,769
TOTALS - GAS CIP	1,917,144	\$16,406,430	115,987

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Municipalities include only large utilities that reported energy savings for 2006 and 2007. The City of Virginia is not included since it had not submitted a CIP filing by the time of this report.

#### D. SAVINGS BY MARKET SECTOR

Tables 3a and 3b report energy savings by market sector (residential, commercial/industrial/agricultural, other) for each utility.

The savings by market sector was determined as follows. For IOUs, each CIP project is classified by market sector. The savings in each market sector were then determined by simply adding up the savings for all projects in that sector. For cooperatives and municipals, CIP projects are not typically classified in this manner and may span multiple sectors. Therefore, the savings in each sector was estimated by the proportion of total project spending in that sector.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Greater Minnesota Gas did not submit a 2007 CIP status report by the time of this report.

Table 3a: 2006 CIP Savings by Market Sector

	Residential (kWh)	C/I/Ag (kWH)	Other (kWh)	Total (kWh)
Electric IOUs				, ,
Alliant Energy	550,395	13,086,516	0	13,636,911
Minnesota Power	9,080,281	36,860,657	0	45,940,938
Otter Tail Power	2,687,537	11,340,173	0	14,027,710
Xcel Energy	12,322,185	244,063,852	0	256,386,037
Totals - IOU Electrics	24,640,398	305,351,198	0	329,991,596
Electric Coops				
Dairyland Power Coop	2,433,227	49,658	0	2,482,889
East River Electric Power Coop, Inc.	380,884	0	0	383,959
Great River Energy	15,238,954	16,837,248	0	32,076,202
Minnesota Valley Coop Light & Power Assoc	99,385	370,115	0	469,500
Minnkota Power Coop	3,292,621	957,734	0	4,634,379
Sioux Valley Southwestern Electric	1,805,610	183,901	0	1,989,511
Totals - Electric Coops	23,250,681	18,398,655	0	42,036,440
Electric Municipals <sup>1</sup>				
Alexandria Light & Power	369,684	446,655	0	933,739
Benson Municipal Utilities	85,714	14,919	0	100,633
Brainerd Public Utilities	130,830	2,285,437	6,600	2,314,037
City of Anoka	114,944	1,278,639	0	1,425,198
City of Jackson	151,974	8,304	0	160,278
City of Luverne	197,971	523,651	0	721,622
Detroit Lakes Public Utility	338,022	35,841	0	373,863
East Grand Forks Water & Light Dept.	73,437	49,352	39,625	162,414
Glencoe Light & Power Commission	35,268	281,996	0	317,264
Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission	1,134,195	718,892	0	1,853,086
Hibbing Public Utilities Commission	1,134,193	0	11,655	
Hutchinson Utilities Commission	991,376	173,694	0	11,655
Marshall Municipal Utilities	615,269	1,177,732	0	1,264,611
Melrose Public Utilities	84,280		0	1,793,001
	· ·	1,010,240		1,094,520
Minnesota Municipal Power Agency Moorhead Public Service	132,144	724,545	0	856,689
	126,201	1,155,823		1,282,024
New Ulm Public Utilities	110,372	1,671,988	0	1,889,810
Shakopee Public Utilities	1,707,194	2,043,252	710,379	4,462,076
Southern MN Municipal Power Agency	1,256,588	2,819,285	8,408	4,125,429
St. James Municipal Light & Power	44,381	1,147	28,180	73,708
Thief River Falls Municipal Utility	724,194	67,399	0	791,592
Triad (Austin, Owatonna, Rochester)	1,593,468	10,744,787	61,131	12,399,386
Wadena Light & Water	28,599	0	0	28,599
Willmar Municipal Utilities	202,875	572,236	0	775,110
Windom Municipal Utilities	70,023	11,651	1,741	83,415
Worthington Public Utilities	206,158	470,600	0	676,758
<b>Totals - Electric Municipals</b>	10,525,160	28,288,063	867,719	39,970,517
TOTALS - ELECTRIC CIP	58,416,239	352,037,917	867,719	411,998,552

Table 3a: 2006 CIP Savings by Market Sector (continued)

	Residential (kWh)	C/I/Ag (kWH)	Other (kWh)	Total (kWh)
Gas IOUs	` ,	,		,
Alliant	7,764	16,024	0	23,788
CenterPoint Energy	178,162	759,112	0	937,274
Great Plains Natural Gas	6,962	6,915	0	13,877
Greater Minnesota Gas	1,709	0	0	1,709
Minnesota Energy Resources - NMU	9,592	12,638	0	22,230
Minnesota Energy Resources - PNG	54,333	97,185	0	151,518
Xcel Energy	158,043	768,986	0	927,029
Totals - Gas IOUs	416,565	1,660,860	0	2,077,425
Gas Municipals				
Duluth Dept. of Public Works	8,087	0	0	8,087
Hutchinson Utilities Commission	922	0	0	922
Triad (Austin & Owatonna)	7,508	1,105	0	8,613
Totals - Gas Municipals	16,517	1,105	0	17,622
TOTALS - GAS CIP	433,082	1,661,965	0	2,095,047

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Municipalities include only large utilities that reported energy savings for 2006 and 2007. The City of Virginia is not included since it had not submitted a CIP filing by the time of this report.

Table 3b: 2007 CIP Savings by Market Sector

	Residential	C/I/Ag	Other	Total
	(kWh)	(kWh)	(kWh)	(kWh)
Electric IOUs				
Alliant Energy	769,616	16,220,825	0	16,990,441
Minnesota Power	9,479,950	34,688,064	0	44,168,014
Otter Tail Power	2,721,259	8,896,561	0	11,617,820
Xcel Energy	13,838,906	245,368,915	0	259,207,821
Totals - IOU Electrics	26,809,731	305,174,365	0	331,984,096
Electric Coops				
Dairyland Power Coop	3,252,216	66,372	0	3,318,591
East River Electric Power Coop, Inc.	292,304	0	0	295,529
Great River Energy	23,416,921	34,643,924	0	58,060,845
Minnesota Valley Coop Light & Power Assoc	116,215	438,335	0	554,550
Minnkota Power Coop	3,264,304	705,152	0	5,061,664
Sioux Valley Southwestern Electric	1,955,346	209,450	0	2,164,796
Totals - Electric Coops	32,297,306	36,063,233	0	69,455,975
Electric Municipals				
Alexandria Light & Power	432,392	471,661	0	1,266,653
Benson Municipal Utilities	103,111	167,931	0	271,042
Brainerd Public Utilities	278,550	1,677,877	0	1,956,427
City of Anoka	88,826	671,280	0	804,650
City of Jackson	131,836	628,336	0	760,172
City of Luverne	163,152	0	0	558,482

Table 3b: 2007 CIP Savings by Market Sector (continued)

Table 30. 2007 CH Savii	Residential	C/I/Ag	Other	Total
	(kWh)	(kWh)	(kWh)	(kWh)
Detroit Lakes Public Utility	155,179	450,829	0	606,008
East Grand Forks Water & Light Dept.	109,728	475,207	8,427	593,362
Glencoe Light & Power Commission	34,172	206,180	463,197	703,549
Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission	1,102,515	581,307	0	1,683,822
Hibbing Public Utilities Commission	152,939	13,413	12,285	178,637
Hutchinson Utilities Commission	1,682,600	3,660,685	0	5,624,104
Marshall Municipal Utilities	734,139	2,882,004	0	3,628,227
Melrose Public Utilities	16,655	164,944	0	181,599
Minnesota Municipal Power Agency	207,760	1,025,771	812,101	2,045,632
Moorhead Public Service	140,857	1,117,052	0	1,257,909
New Ulm Public Utilities	250,690	1,541,796	267,253	2,129,389
Shakopee Public Utilities	3,746,462	3,250,479	646,452	7,653,643
Southern MN Municipal Power Agency	4,107,720	1,997,249	7,262	6,112,231
St. James Municipal Light & Power	230,520	86,337	12,811	329,668
Thief River Falls Municipal Utility	581,276	141,046	0	722,322
Triad (Austin, Owatonna, Rochester)	3,465,589	16,363,026	67,375	19,895,990
Wadena Light & Water	13,261	271	0	13,532
Willmar Municipal Utilities	319,668	866,442	0	1,186,110
Windom Municipal Utilities	107,012	1,373,910	0	1,480,922
Worthington Public Utilities	159,971	298,574	0	458,545
Totals - Electric Municipals	18,516,580	40,113,606	2,297,163	62,102,627
TOTALS - ELECTRIC CIP	77,623,617	381,351,204	2,297,163	463,542,698
	Residential	C/I/Ag	Other	Total
2 - 2 - 2 - 2	(MCF)	(MCF)	(MCF)	(MCF)
Gas IOUs			_	
Alliant	7,950	7,146	0	15,096
CenterPoint Energy	164,971	660,060	0	825,031
Great Plains Natural Gas	5,338	12,320	0	17,658
Greater Minnesota Gas <sup>2</sup>				
Minnesota Energy Resources - NMU	7,062	15,694	0	22,756
Minnesota Energy Resources - PNG	42,341	76,558	0	118,899
Xcel Energy	147,851	740,609	0	888,460
Totals - Gas IOUs	375,513	1,512,387	0	1,887,900
Gas Municipals				
Duluth Dept. of Public Works	3,933	275	0	4,208
Hutchinson Utilities Commission	1,257	0	4,615	5,872
Triad (Austin & Owatonna)	8,669	9,922	573	19,164
Totals - Gas Municipals	13,859	10,197	5,188	29,244
TOTALS - GAS CIP	389,372	1,522,584	5,188	1,917,144

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Municipalities include only large utilities that reported energy savings for 2006 and 2007. The City of Virginia is not included since it had not submitted a CIP filing by the time of this report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Greater Minnesota Gas did not submit a 2007 CIP status report by the time of this report.

#### V. CONCLUSION

The savings levels shown for 2006 and 2007 represent utility activities prior to the passage of the NGEA, where utilities were focusing their program activities on achieving a desired level of spending. Meeting the 1.5 percent energy conservation goal will require a tremendous increase in program activity. As can be seen in table 4 below, the energy savings required to meet the energy savings goal is approximately double the 2007 savings achievements of electric utilities and nearly 2.5 times the 2007 savings achievements for natural gas utilities. The CO<sub>2</sub> savings associated with this level of energy savings would potentially increase by the same factors.

Table 4: 2005 Minnesota Energy Consumption and Approximate Energy Savings Goal<sup>10</sup>

Electricity	kWh	Percentage of 2007 achievements
2005 MN Consumption	66,568,000,000	
Less Opt-Out Consumption	59,572,713,959	
1.5% Goal	893,590,709	193%
Natural Gas	MCF	Percentage of 2007 achievements
2005 MN Consumption	328,955,000	
Less Opt-Out Consumption	309,407,179	
1.5% Goal	4.641.108	242%

Meeting this level of savings is not without its challenges, and will require strong efforts by all parties involved, including utilities, their trade allies, energy service providers, the OES, and energy consumers.

/sm

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> All consumption figures from the Minnesota Utility Data Book, 1965 – 2005, http://www.state.mn.us/mn/externalDocs/Commerce/Utility\_Data\_Book, 1965-2000\_030603120425\_UtilityDataBook65thru05.pdf